

Exhibit 3.3.1 Characteristics of a Comprehensive Staff Development Program and Auditors' Assessment of Approach Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001		
Characteristics	Adequate	Inadequate
1. Has policy that directs staff development efforts		X
2. Has a plan that provides a framework for integrating innovations related to mission.		X
3. Has a staff development mission in place.		X
4. Is built using a long-range planning approach.		X
5. Fosters an expectation for professional growth.	X	
6. Provides for organizational, unit, and individual development in a systematic manner.		X
7. Is for all employees.		X
8. Expects all supervisors to be staff developers of staff supervised.		X
9. Focuses on organizational changes--staff development efforts are aligned with district goals.		X
10. Is based on a careful analysis of data and is data-driven.		X
11. Focuses on proven research-based approaches that have shown to increase productivity.		X
12. Provides for three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.		X
13. Is based on human learning and development and adult learning.		X
14. Uses a variety of staff development approaches.	X	
15. Provides the follow-up and on-the-job application necessary to ensure improvement.		X
16. Requires an evaluation process that is ongoing, includes multiple sources of information, focuses on all levels of the organization and is based on actual changed behavior.		X
17. Provides for system-wide coordination and has a clearinghouse function in place.		X
18. Provides the necessary funding to carry out staff development goals.	X	
Total	3	15

Further discussion of the criteria listed above and the extent to which the criteria were met is provided below.

Criterion 1: This criterion was not met. The following Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District school board policies relate directly to staff development:

- *Board Policy DMA (Legal) Professional Development: Staff Development* is the statutory and case law-driven capstone policy that deals with staff development. The following important points are worthy of note:
 - The district shall "budget adequate time and financial resources to support a comprehensive staff development program," and the "program shall be guided by the campus improvement plan...and shall reflect best practices."
 - "Staff development training shall include training in technology, conflict resolution and discipline strategies, including classroom management."
 - "...the campus and district (site-based decision-making) committees shall identify staff development needs for teachers and administrators" and, "[S]taff development shall be predominately campus-based, related to achieving campus performance objectives."
 - The policy details a number of acceptable staff development activities, as outlined in the Texas Education Code.

- District-wide staff development must be “developed and approved through the district-level decision process” (i.e., by the Uvalde District Education Improvement Committee).
- “Staff development shall focus on standards for student performance in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills.”
- “The district’s staff development program should reflect the standards of professional practices recognized at state and national levels.”
- [Title I Staff Development] “A district...shall provide high-quality professional development that will improve the teaching of the academic subjects...to enable all children to meet the state’s student performance standards....”
- *Board Policy DMA (Local) Professional Development: Staff Development* is the local policy approved by the board that extends the legally required policy. This policy is only a paragraph in length, but includes explicit requirement that the “superintendent and principals shall develop a staff development plan and shall present the plan to the board for approval each year.” The plan must include details for funding. “The superintendent and other administrative staff shall be responsible for implementing the plan.”
- *Board Policy DMB (Legal) Professional Development: Special Programs Training* provides direction regarding the statutorily required training for staff working with special populations. The policy requires that the district develop a plan that identifies and meets “... personnel training needs for the education of students with disabilities,” and that this plan should “... be an integral part of the district’s...staff development program.” This policy also provides for the required staff development of personnel working with students identified as gifted and talented. Teachers must have a minimum base of 30 hours of staff development related to the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students and must secure a minimum of six hours annually. Administrators and counselors who have authority for program decisions must have a minimum of six hours of training related to the gifted and talented student.

These board policies and other policies that address specific target audiences (i.e., special education, gifted and talented personnel) or areas of staff development provide an expectation for staff development. However, detail and specificity are insufficient to provide clear direction to the administration regarding the design and delivery of quality staff development for all employees.

Criterion 2: This criterion was not met. No staff development plan was submitted to the auditors for review. Central office personnel reported a written plan is currently in progress.

Criterion 3: This criterion was not met. A staff development mission was never referenced in interviews or provided to the auditors.

Criterion 4: This criterion was not met. There was no indication or documentation of a long-range planning approach to staff development. On the contrary, evidence indicated that decisions are made annually. Furthermore, most of the sessions actually delivered were not in an annual planning document (District or Campus Improvement Plans).

Exhibit 3.3.2 presents a comparison of district-wide planned staff development and actual offerings at the district/department and campus-based level.

Exhibit 3.3.2 Comparison of District Improvement Plan Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001			
Staff Development Topic	DIP Planned	Offered District	Campus
1. 11th Grade Exit Level TAAS		X	
2. 1st/2nd Grade Dual Language Update		X	
3. 3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update		X	
4. CLASS Training (Dept. of Education Services)		X	
5. Classroom Organization and Management Program		X	
6. Content Mastery (Dept. of Education Services)		X	
7. Cooperative Discipline		X	
8. Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom		X	
9. Deep Alignment Strategies for Grade 3-5 TAAS Mathematics		X	
10. Deepening Understanding in the Elementary Social Studies Classroom		X	
11. Deepening Understanding in the Secondary Social Studies Classroom		X	
12. Destination Word Identification: Grades K-6		X	
13. Dynamite "Hands-On" Instructional Strategies for Math		X	
14. Effective teaching practices and strategies (new & current teachers)	X		X
15. First Grade Teacher Reading Academy	X	X	
16. Grade K-2 Articulation to Grade 3 TAAS/TEKS Math		X	
17. GT certification training for Dalton Elementary kindergarten staff	X	X	
18. GT nomination procedures (all faculties)	X		
19. Guided Reading: Strategies for Differentiating Literacy Instruction		X	
20. Implementing the Social Studies Toolkit-Secondary Session		X	
21. Kindergarten Academy Training	X		
22. LPAC training for GT, SpEd, and bilingual instructional staff	X		
23. Managing Disruptive Behavior and Teaching Personal Responsibility (Flores staff)		X	
24. National Reading Styles Institute		X	
25. PK-12 Vertical Math Alignment	X	*X	
26. Reading Styles and Carbo Recorded Book Method	X	X	
27. Referral process for special education (bilingual/ESL teachers)	X		
28. Research Training for Teachers Using the Texas Library Connection (Librarians)		X	
29. Safety Training	X		X
30. Summer bilingual institute (bilingual teachers)	X		
31. Training and technical assistance from Lupe Lloyd & Associates (bilingual teachers)	X		
32. Training for Campus Assistance Teams	X		
Total	13	23	2
*Partially addressed -- at grades K-3 only			

As noted in Exhibit 3.3.2,

- A disparity exists between district-wide planned and delivered staff development.

- Of the 13 staff development topics listed in the District Improvement Plan and the 20 that were actually offered at the district/departmental level, only six (18 percent) were both planned and delivered.
- Four of the six topics were planned and delivered at the district-wide level and two at the campus level.
- Seven (54 percent) of the 13 planned offerings were not delivered at the campus or district-wide level.
- Nineteen (83 percent) of the 23 offerings were not included in the overall district planning efforts.

Exhibit 3.3.3 provides more detailed information regarding the match between planned and delivered staff development, using the campus as the unit of comparison. To that end, many listings are duplicated—included for all campuses for which the staff development was either planned/sponsored and/or delivered to one or more employees.

Exhibit 3.3.3 Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
Uvalde High	*Conflict Resolution (listed on CIP "checklist" but not otherwise referenced in the plan)			X
	*Discipline Management (listed on CIP "checklist" but not otherwise referenced in the plan)			
	*Technology	X		
	^Cooperative Discipline			X
	~GT Certification Training	X	X	
	~GT Nomination Procedures	X	X	
	~The Gifted Student in the Regular Classroom	X		
	11th Grade Exit Level TAAS			P
	Campus Assistance Team Training	X	X	
	Cognitive Modification	X		
	Content Mastery			X
	Crisis Management Plan	X		P
	Curriculum Alignment of Science TEKS			X
	Deepening Understanding in the Sec. Social Studies			P
	Effective Reading and Writing Teaching Strategies	X	X	
	Implementing the Social Studies Toolkit-Secondary			X
	Improving TAAS Scores and Passing Rate of Special Population Students	X		
	Learning Styles	X		
	LPAC Training for Special Ed, GT, and Bilingual Instructional Staff	X	X	
	Maintaining a Safe School	X	X	
	PK-12 Vertical Math Alignment Training	X	X	
	Planning for TEKS	X		P
	Safety Training	X	X	
	Sheltered English Strategies for ESL Students	X		
	Special Education Referral Process for Bilingual/ESL Teachers	X	X	
	Special Programs (Bilingual, Special Ed)			X
	TAAS II			X
	Total	17	8	5P, 7X

Exhibit 3.3.3 (continued) Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
Uvalde Jr. High	*Conflict Resolution	X		
	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Technology	X		
	^Classroom Organization & Management Program			X
	^Cooperative Discipline			X
	~Gifted/Talented			X
	Academic Teaming	X		P
	CLASS Training			X
	Code of Conduct			P
	Content Mastery			X
	Crisis Management	X		P
	Deepening Understanding in the Sec. Social Studies			P
	Employee Handbook			P
	Employee Policies	X		P
	Implementing the Social Studies Toolkit-Secondary			X
	Learning Styles	X		
	LEP/ESL	X		P
	Lesson Plans	X		P
	New Jersey Writing	X		
	PDAS			P
	Reading Styles	X	X	P
	School Safety	X		
	Schools for the 21st Century	X		
	Sexual Harassment			P
	Sheltered English Strategies (for regular teachers)	X		
	Special Education Modifications	X		P
	Student Code of Conduct	X		P
	Teacher/Student Handbooks	X		P
	Understanding Social Studies by Design			X
	Using the Internet (Star-net)	X		X
	Utilizing Parent Input	X		
	Zeroes Aren't Permitted	X		P
	Total	20	1	16P, 8X
Excel Academy	*Conflict Resolution	X		
	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Novanet	X		P
	~Gifted/Talented	X		X
	11th Grade Exit Level TAAS			P
	Academy for Creative Education			X
	Crisis Management Plan			P
	Deepening Understanding in the Sec. Social Studies			P
	Employee Handbook			P
	Schools for the 21st Century			X
	Sexual Harassment			P

Exhibit 3.3.3 (continued) Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
	Student Code of Conduct			P
	TAAS Preparation			X
	Dropout Prevention	X		X
	Alternative Education Programs			P
	TAAE Conference	X		X
	Special Ed., Bilingual, Title I, At-Risk	X		X
	Tech Prep	X		X
	Total	8	0	9P, 8X
Flores Elementary	*Conflict Resolution			
	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Technology	X		X
	^Classroom Organization & Management Program			X
	^Cooperative Discipline			X
	^Managing Disruptive Behavior and Teaching Personal Responsibility			P
	~Gifted and Talented			
	3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update			X
	Assessment	X		P
	CLASS Training			X
	Closer Look at TAAS Math			X
	Content Mastery			X
	Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom			X
	Crisis Management Plan			P
	Deep Alignment Strategies for Grades 3-5 TAAS Math			X
	Deepening Understanding in the Elem. Social Studies			P
	Destination Word Identification Grades K-6			X
	Dynamite "Hands On" Math			X
	Guided Reading	X		X
	Guiding Readers and Writers	X		
	Lupe-Lloyd & Associates (bilingual teachers)	X	X	
	Meeting Needs of Readers			X
	National Conference of Texas	X		
	New Jersey Reading & Grammar	X		
	New Jersey Writing Project	X		
	PDAS			P
	PK-12 Vertical Math Alignment	X	X	
	Reading Styles	X	X	X
	Recorded Books	X		
	Safety Training	X	X	
	Schools for the 21st Century	X		X
	Sexual Harassment	X		P
	Strategies for Teaching Reading Comprehension	X		
	Targeted Test Items (TAAS Math)			X
	Total	16	4	7P, 16X

Exhibit 3.3.3 (continued) Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
Anthon Elementary	*Conflict Resolution	X		P
	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Technology (CEI, computer lab, Accelerated Reader, library internet)	X		
	^Classroom Organization & Management Program			X
	^Cooperative Discipline			X
	~Gifted and Talented			
	1st/2nd Grade Dual Language Update			P
	3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update			P
	Bilingual Summer Institute	X	X	
	Code of Conduct	X		P
	Content Mastery			X
	Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom			X
	Crisis Management	X		P
	Curriculum	X		P
	Deep Alignment Strategies for Grades 3-5 TAAS Math			X
	Deepening Understanding in the Elem. Social Studies			P
	Destination Word Identification Grades K-6			X
	District/Campus Curriculum Development/Alignment	X		
	Dynamite "Hands On" Math			X
	Employee Policy Book	X		P
	First Aid Training (paraprofessionals)	X		P
	First Grade Reading Academy	X	X	P
	Grade K-2 Articulation to Grade 3 TAAS/TEKS Math			X
	Grading Practices	X		P
	Guided Reading			X
	New Teacher Orientation	X		P
	PDAS			P
	Reading Styles		X	P
	Schools for the 21st Century (new teachers)			X
	Seven Correlates of Effective Schools	X		P
	Sexual Harassment	X		P
	STAR	X		
	Stevenson Reading	X		P
	Student Handbook	X		P
	Total	18	3	19P, 10X
Benson Elementary	*Conflict Resolution	X		P
	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Technology (Internet, CEI, E-mail, computer labs)	X		
	*Technology Update	X		P
	^Classroom Organization & Management Program			X
	^Cooperative Discipline			X
	~Gifted and Talented			
	1st/2nd Grade Dual Language Update			P

Exhibit 3.3.3 (continued) Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
	Schools for the 21st Century			X
	3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update			P
	Attendance	X		P
	Content Mastery			X
	Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom			X
	Crisis Management Plan	X		P
	Curriculum Development	X		P
	Deep Alignment Strategies for Grades 3-5 TAAS Math			X
	Deepening Understanding in the Elem. Social Studies			P
	Destination Word Identification Grades K-6			X
	Dynamite "Hands On" Math			X
	Edward Concinio			X
	First Grade Reading Academy	X	X	P
	Grades K-2 Articulation to Grade 3 TAAS/TEKS Math			X
	Grading Policies	X		P
	GT Nomination Procedures	X	X	
	Guided Reading			X
	Homework Policies	X		P
	LPAC Training for GT, Sp. Ed. and Bilingual Staff	X	X	
	Lupe Lloyd & Associates (bilingual teachers)	X		
	PDAS	X		
	Reading Styles and Marie Carbo Method	X	X	P
	Sexual Harassment	X		P
	Special Education Referral Process (bilingual teachers)	X	X	
	Summer Bilingual Institute	X	X	
	TAAS Disaggregation	X		
	Teacher Handbook	X		P
	Total	20	6	15P, 11X
Robb Elementary	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Technology (Internet, digital camera, e-mail, CEL...)	X		
	^Cooperative Discipline	X		X
	~Gifted and Talented			
	1st/2nd Grade Dual Language Update			P
	3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update			P
	Bilingual Program Technical Support	X		
	Campus Handbook	X		P
	Code of Conduct			P
	Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom			X
	Crisis Management Plan	X		P
	Curriculum Development/Planning	X		P
	Deep Alignment Strategies for Grades 3-5 TAAS Math			X
	Deepening Understanding in the Elem. Social Studies			P
	Destination Word Identification Grades K-6			X
	Dynamite "Hands On" Math			X
	Effective Teaching			X

Exhibit 3.3.3 (continued) Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
	First Grade Reading Academy		X	P
	Grades K-2 Articulation to Grade 3 TAAS/TEKS Math			X
	Guided Reading			X
	Mentors for Teachers	X		
	Model Teaching	X		
	Model/Shared Reading			X
	Modification Training Orientation	X		
	Parent Conferencing Skills	X		
	PDAS			P
	Reading Styles	X	X	X
	Schools for the 21st Century	X		
	Sexual Harassment			X
	Special Education	X		P
	TAAS Disaggregation	X		X
	TAAS/TEKS Alignment	X		
	Vertical/Horizontal Planning	X		
	Total	17	2	11P, 12X
Dalton EC	911	X		
	*Conflict Resolution			P
	*Discipline Management	X		P
	*Technology (computer programs that correlate with TEKS, Jostens, IBM. . .)	X		
	^Classroom Management	X		
	^Cooperative Discipline			X
	~Training for GT Certification	X	X	X
	Campus Assistance Teams	X	X	
	Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom			X
	Early Childhood Strategies	X		
	Effective Writing Strategies Linked to TEKS and PK Guidelines	X		
	Grade K-2 Articulation to Grade 3 Math TAAS/TEKS			X
	Guided Reading			X
	LPAC Training for GT, SpEd and Bilingual Staff	X		
	Lupe Lloyd & Associates (bilingual teachers)	X		
	PDAS			P
	Phonemic Awareness			X
	PK & Kinder Math Workshop			X
	Safety Training	X		P
	Schools for the 21st Century			X
	Sexual Harassment			P
	Summer Bilingual Institute	X		
	Total	12	2	5P, 8X
Batesville	*Conflict Resolution	X		P
	*Discipline Management	X		X
	*Technology (PowerPoint. . .)	X		P
	^Classroom Organization & Management Program			X

Exhibit 3.3.3 (continued) Comparison of Planned Staff Development Listings and Delivered Staff Development Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001				
Site	Staff Development	Planned		Offered
		CIP	DIP	
	^Cooperative Discipline	X		P
	~Gifted and Talented			
	1st/2nd Grade Dual Language Update			P
	Schools for the 21st Century	X		X
	3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update			P
	Campus Handbook	X		
	Child Abuse/Sexual Harassment	X		P
	Conducting ARD Meetings	X		X
	Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom			X
	Crisis Management			P
	Deep Alignment Strategies for Grades 3-5 TAAS Math			X
	Deepening Understanding in the Elem Social Studies			P
	Defying Anger and Aggression			X
	Destination Word Identification Grades K-6			X
	Dynamite "Hands On" Math			X
	First Grade Reading Academy		X	P
	Guided Reading			X
	Implementing the Social Studies Toolkit-Secondary			X
	Managing and Differentiating Reading Instruction for all Subjects			X
	Master Teacher bulletin distribution	X		X
	PDAS	X		P
	PK-3 Articulation			X
	Quality Classroom Instruction	X		X
	Reading Professional Articles	X		X
	Reading Styles			P
	Recognizing Quality Classrooms & Quality Teachers	X		P
	Social Studies TEKS			X
	Special Education			X
	Strategies for Co-planning and Co-teaching			X
	Teacher Handbook			P
	TEKS/Lesson Plans	X		P
	Vertical Subject Alignment	X		
	Visiting Programs Already in Place (new teachers)	X		
	Total	16	1	14P, 19X
	Grand Total	144	27	101P 19X=200 Total
*State required staff development for all teachers ^May meet requirement for discipline management ~State required for all teachers providing instruction and services in GT programs and all administrators and counselors who have authority for program decisions				

The main points indicated in Exhibit 3.3.3 are:

- Many topics (a total of 60) for all campuses listed as "offered" are reported with a "P" indicating that they were actually delivered in August prior to final approval of District and Campus Improvement Plans in September. Therefore, it was difficult for the auditors to determine if planning preceded delivery.

- Many of the offerings are general in topic, giving little insight as to the specific focus. Examples are “special education,” “learning styles,” “safety training,” “technology,” “GT certification training.”
- A staff development component was not included in the Excel Academy Campus Improvement Plan that was provided to the auditors.
- A list of August staff development training opportunities was not included in the Dalton Campus Improvement Plan that was provided to the auditors.
- Only two campuses (Batesville and Benson) met the legal requirement of offering staff development in discipline management, conflict resolution, and technology at the campus level. When the district-wide offerings in discipline management were considered as an option, employees on the seven remaining campuses still were not offered staff development opportunities in one or both of the other two areas.
- Only three of the nine campuses offered the state required training for personnel working with or in the gifted and talented programs.
- All campuses included planned staff development in respective Campus-Improvement Plans, with the exception of the Excel Academy.
- The number of planned campus staff development topics ranged from a low of zero (0) for the Excel Academy to a high of 20, with seven of the nine campuses planning 15-20 different offerings.
- Of the 136 campus-planned offerings, 24 (18 percent) were also included in the District Improvement Plan.
- Excluding staff development sessions conducted prior to the approval of the District and Campus Improvement Plans, only 12 (15 percent) of the 80 staff development topics planned at the campus level were actually offered.
- Including staff development sessions conducted prior to the approval of the District and Campus Improvement Plans, 72 (53 percent) of the 136 staff development topics planned at the campus level were actually delivered.
- Excluding staff development sessions conducted prior to the approval of District and Campus Improvement Plans, only 12 (13 percent) of the 95 staff development sessions actually offered were planned.
- Including staff development sessions conducted prior to the approval of District and Campus Improvement Plans, 75 (38 percent) of the 195 staff development sessions actually delivered were planned.

Criterion 5: This criterion was met. *Board Policies DMA (Legal) and (Local) Professional Development: Staff Development* and other series D policies communicate an expectation of staff development.

Criterion 6: This criterion was not met. Evidence of sequential, systematic development at the organizational (district-wide), unit (campus or department), and individual (employee) levels was not provided. Most of the campus-based offerings were either campus or employee based, while all of the district-wide efforts were offered on an individual basis with the exception of a session entitled “Managing Disruptive Behavior and Teaching Personal Responsibility,” which was offered to all employees at Flores.

Criterion 7: This criterion was not met. Evidence that staff development is provided to all employees was not provided to the auditors. The target audience for all district-wide staff development workshops was teachers. A few campus administrators reported attending an annual “legal update.” However, such a workshop was not included in the district-wide log or the campus-based listings. The department of educational services conducted or arranged for its staff to attend technology and/or Visual Phonics training on a February 2001 staff development day, and a district-

wide training in conducting research on the Internet for librarians was provided on the same day. The contracted food service provider (Aramark) provided regular training for food service workers and staff.

Criterion 8: This criterion was not met. Of the 18 identified supervisor job descriptions reviewed by the auditors, only 11 (61 percent) included the responsibility of serving as the staff developer of persons supervised.

Criterion 9: This criterion was not met. Most staff development offerings were related to one the five district goals, with most being aligned to Goal 1: students meeting full educational potential. Because of the broad nature of this goal, any academically related staff development could be considered indirectly aligned.

Exhibit 3.3.4 displays the alignment of district-wide and campus-based staff development offerings to the five goals approved by the board of trustees. Data in this exhibit are unduplicated in that district-offered or sponsored sessions attended by campus personnel are not included in the campus counts.

Exhibit 3.3.4 Comparison of District-wide and Campus Staff Development Offerings to District Goals Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001							
Site	# of Offerings	~District Goals					# of Goal Matches
		1	2	3	4	5	
District-wide	23	17	0	0	3	3	23
Uvalde High	7	4	0	0	3	0	7
Uvalde Jr. High	15	7	0	0	4	1	12
Excel	14	5	0	1	4	1	11
Flores	11	6	0	0	3	1	10
Anthon Elementary	15	4	0	0	6	0	10
Benson Elementary	12	3	0	0	4	1	8
Robb Elementary	9	5	0	0	3	0	8
Dalton Early Childhood	8	4	0	0	4	0	8
Batesville School	26	11	0	0	7	1	19
Total	140	66	0	1	41	8	116
~District Goals: 1--Students reaching full educational potential 2--Parents and community members full partners 3--Dropout prevention 4--Safe and disciplined environment 5--Technology Implementation							

Important points presented in Exhibit 3.3.4 are as follows:

- All 23 of the district-wide offerings related to three of the five goals.
- Seventeen (73 percent) of the 23 district-wide offerings were related to Goal 1.
- Three (13 percent) of the 23 district-wide offerings were aligned to Goal 4.
- Three (13 percent) of the 23 district-wide offerings aligned to Goal 5.
- The percentage of match between campus offerings and one of the district goals ranged from 67 percent (Anthon) to 100 percent (Dalton and Uvalde High).
- None of the offered district-wide or campus-based staff development aligned to Goals 2.
- Goal 3 was addressed by the Excel campus in one offering.

Criterion 10: This criterion was not met. No evidence was presented to the auditors that documents an established, clinical process for the systematic assessment of student and staff needs for the

purpose of providing a foundation for the planning of data-driven staff development at the district, departmental, or campus level.

As a general rule, district-wide offerings were in response to what teachers reported they needed/wanted on an annual survey conducted by the central office administration. Although the ostensible purpose of the survey was to identify needs for staff development, no needs-based documentation is required, and several campus staff do not make the connection between what is offered and what is needed, as documented by the following comments:

- "One of our weaknesses is connecting staff development to the actual need of students."
- "We need to be matching staff development to the exact needs of the child, making connections between the deficits and strengths of the child."
- "We do surveys and the teachers write what they want."
- "The district usually provides the staff development for us. The district offered choices. It's the teacher's choice in the summer."
- "We usually don't get to decide that (staff development)."
- "Staff development? They go in there and throw it together."
- "Doesn't always pan out when we tell central office what we need (staff development)."
- "Pet projects are identified at central office. Everybody gets trained, but there's no follow-up. Whatever central office decides."
- "Central office sends out a [staff development] survey. [Results of the] surveys are not given back to the campus. Campuses are then told what the staff development has to be."

The 2000-2001 District Improvement Plan included a seven-point needs assessment process that the district used to establish annual goals and objectives for the current year, but the steps are focused on outcomes rather than curriculum design and/or delivery changes that are likely to result in the desired outcomes. The only explicit reference to staff development was found in point two: "The [DEIC] gathered input on staff development needs...."

Exhibit 3.3.5 highlights linkages between district-wide and departmental staff development and the eight identified outcomes of the assessment process described above. The eight areas are directly related to achieving the Texas Education Agency accreditation ratings of "Recognized" or "Exemplary."

Exhibit 3.3.5 Comparison of District-wide Staff Development Offerings to Needs Assessment Process and Outcomes Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001								
Staff Development Offering	*Targeted Areas							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. 11th Grade Exit Level TAAS		X	X	X			X	
2. 1st/2nd Grade Dual Language Update		X		X				
3. 3rd-6th Grade Dual Language Update		X		X				
4. CLASS Training								
5. Classroom Organization and Management Program								
6. Content Mastery								
7. Cooperative Discipline								
8. Creating a Balanced Literacy Classroom		X		X				
9. Deep Alignment Strategies for Grade 3-5 TAAS Mathematics			X					
10. Deepening Understanding in the Elementary Social Studies Classroom								
11. Deepening Understanding in the Secondary Social Studies Classroom								

Exhibit 3.3.5 (continued) Comparison of District-wide Staff Development Offerings to Needs Assessment Process and Outcomes Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2000-2001								
Staff Development Offering	*Targeted Areas							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Destination Word Identification: Grades K-6		X						
13. Dynamite "Hands-On" Instructional Strategies for Math			X					
14. First Grade Reading Academy		X						
15. Grades K-2 Articulation to Grade 3 TAAS/TEKS Mathematics			X					
16. GT Certification Training for Dalton Elem. Kindergarten								
17. Guided Reading: Strategies for Differentiating Literacy Instruction		X						
18. Implementing the Social Studies Toolkit-Secondary Session								
19. Managing Disruptive Behavior and Teaching Personal Responsibility								
20. National Reading Styles Institute		X						
21. PK-12 Vertical Math Alignment			X					
22. Reading Styles and Marie Carbo Recorded Book Method		X						
23. Research Training for Teachers Using Texas Library Connection (Librarians)								
Total	0	9	5	4	0	0	1	0
*Targeted Areas in DIP Needs Assessment: 1. Dropout Rate 2. TAAS Reading (All students, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged) 3. TAAS Mathematics (Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students) 4. TAAS Writing (Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students) 5. Percentage of students taking SAT/ACT 6. Percentage of students scoring 1110 on the SAT and 24 on the ACT 7. Percentage of students scoring on TAAS at or above the TASP equivalency 8. Percentage of graduates: Recommended High School Program and/or DAP								

Important points presented in Exhibit 3.3.5 are as follows:

- The four targeted areas addressing desired Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) results had the only connections to offered staff development activities.
- Nine (47 percent) of the 19 links were with TAAS Reading.
- No staff development offerings supported any of the remaining four non-TAAS targeted areas.

All campuses except one (Anthon) referenced a needs assessment in respective Campus Improvement Plans. However, there was no uniformity to the needs assessment process utilized among campuses, with approaches varying from reflecting the seven district steps verbatim to a general narrative description of the process. As a result, the auditors could not make valid conclusions regarding specific needs that exuded from the campus needs assessment processes.

Criterion 11: This criterion was not met. A review of the staff development offerings and interviews with staff provided no evidence that the majority of staff development approaches were research-based or known to increase productivity. However, several offerings were in specific programs or techniques familiar to many if not most education personnel, i.e., Cooperative Discipline, Schools for the 21st Century, New Jersey Writing, Marie Carbo Learning Styles.

Criterion 12: This criterion was not met. Knowledge or application of the three change process stages were not evident in staff development offerings.

Criterion 13: This criterion was not met. A clear connection between how adults learn and the content and/or delivery of staff development could not be determined by the auditors.

Criterion 14: This criterion was met. A review of the staff development log and staff interviews indicate some variety in how staff development is offered. For example, some sessions involved "updates," "academies," "hands-on instructional strategies," and "implementing a tool kit."

Criterion 15: This criterion was not met. Follow-up or on-the job application of staff development efforts was not evident. Furthermore, interviews with staff and a review of the district and campus offerings indicate that most of the staff development is theory-based and, therefore, not designed to have long-term impact on teacher behavior and/or student learning.

Criterion 16: This criterion was not met. Documentation of staff development evaluation efforts that incorporated actual change in behavior was not provided to the auditors. The auditors were presented with approximately 30 "reflection papers" on which participants had made comments about the specific session attended. However, no summary, analysis, overall findings, or recommendations pursuant to the comments were provided.

Criterion 17: This criterion was not met. A clearinghouse for all staff development was not identified. Although by state statute and school board policy, the district advisory committee and campus site-based decision-making committees must approve all staff development in the respective plans, there is no indication of a central point of review against any standard or expectation. The director of curriculum currently coordinates staff development of certificated personnel, but no evidence was presented to the auditors indicating that any staff member is responsible for coordinating staff development for all personnel.

Criterion 18: This criterion was met. There was no indication that funding is a deterrent to quality staff development in the district. In fact, *Board Policy DMA (Legal) Professional Development: Staff Development* requires that adequate funding be provided to fund the annual staff development plan. Interviews with staff did not reveal fiscal limitations.

A district's staff development program is considered adequate if it meets 70 percent of the audit criteria presented in Exhibit 3.3.1. The Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District staff development program was rated adequate on three (17 percent) of the 18 criteria. Therefore, it is considered inadequate.

In summary, the auditors found that the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District staff development program is inadequate in design and delivery. The board of trustees has not given sufficient detail via board policies to clearly direct the administrative staff regarding the desired components of a staff development program. Furthermore, the board policy that requires a plan [*Board Policy DMA (Local)*] and the policy [*Board Policy DMA (Legal)*] that stipulates the legally required staff development (technology, discipline management, and conflict resolution) are not being followed. The design, delivery, follow-up, and evaluation of staff development activities are not driven by comprehensive, long-range planning. Staff development is rarely needs-driven, lacks sufficient coordination at the district level, and is unlikely to improve teaching and learning.

STANDARD 4: A School System Uses the Results from System-Designed and/or -Adopted Assessments to Adjust, Improve, or Terminate Ineffective Practices or Programs.

A school system meeting this audit standard has designed a comprehensive system of assessment/testing and uses valid measurement tools that indicate how well its students are achieving designated priority learning goals and objectives. Common indicators are:

- A formative and summative assessment system linked to a clear rationale in board policy;
- Knowledge, local validation, and use of current curricular and program assessment best practices;
- Use of a student and program assessment plan, which provides for diverse assessment strategies for varied purposes at all levels -- district, school, and classroom;
- A way to provide feedback to the teaching and administrative staffs regarding how classroom instruction may be evaluated and subsequently improved;
- A timely and relevant data base upon which to analyze important trends in student achievement;
- A vehicle to examine how well specific programs are actually producing desired learner outcomes or results;
- A data base to compare the strengths and weaknesses of various programs and program alternatives, as well as to engage in equity analysis;
- A data base to modify or terminate ineffective educational programs;;
- A method/means to relate to a programmatic budget and enable the school system to engage in cost-benefit analysis; and
- Organizational data gathered and used to continually improve system functions.

A school system meeting this audit standard has a full range of formal and informal assessment tools that provide program information relevant to decision making at classroom, building (principals and school-site councils), system, and board levels.

A school system meeting this audit standard has taken steps to ensure that the full range of its programs is systematically and regularly examined. Assessment data have been matched to program objectives and are used in decision making.

What the Auditors Expected to Find in the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District

The auditors expected to find a comprehensive assessment program for all aspects of the curriculum, pre-K through the twelfth grade, which:

- Was keyed to a valid, officially adopted, and comprehensive set of goals/objectives of the school district;
- Was used extensively at the site level to engage in program review, analysis, evaluation, and improvement;;
- Was used by the policy-making groups in the system and the community to engage in specific policy review for validity and accuracy;
- Was the foci and basis of formulating short- and long-range plans for continual improvement,
- Was used to establish cost and select needed curriculum alternatives; and
- Was publicly reported on a regular basis in terms that were understood by the key stakeholders in the community.

Overview of What the Auditors Found in the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District

This section is an overview of the findings that follow in the area of Standard Four. The details follow within separate findings.

The auditors found that a comprehensive plan for student and program assessment was lacking in the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District. Student assessment is largely comprised of state-mandated testing primarily in the areas of mathematics and reading. Locally funded testing is limited to testing in language arts beginning in the early grades and continuing through the 11th grade. Additionally, college entrance testing is available, but is not provided for all students. No assessments outside of the core curriculum areas are available in any grade for the staff to be able to assess the effectiveness of enrichment or elective curriculum or instruction. Therefore, the scope of the student assessment program in the district is very limited. Additionally, auditors found that program assessment exists, but information from such assessments is not used for making key decisions about the modification, termination, or enhancement of the programs. The district continues to support programs that have not been subjected to systematic assessment and programmatic review. Finally, auditors found that although student assessment results are improving for all groups of students, Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students' scores on state-wide testing lag behind their Anglo peers' scores.

Finding 4.1: A Comprehensive System for Student and Program Assessment Is Lacking.

A written comprehensive assessment plan creates a district framework to provide direction and guidelines for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data to foster informed decision making for the design and delivery of the curriculum. The district's plan is the vehicle for examining the effectiveness of an educational program in achieving the desired results. Assessment data is a source of feedback to teachers regarding their classroom instruction as well as to administrators for determining the effectiveness of specific programs in achieving district and school goals. The data from a comprehensive assessment plan enable school staff to make decisions about the revision of or elimination of programs.

Auditors examined district documents, including policy, comprehensive planning documents, a list of programs offered within the district, as well as assessment schedules provided by district personnel. In addition, the audit team conducted interviews to determine the extent to which the district has a comprehensive assessment plan in place to support informed decision making.

Overall, auditors found a comprehensive system of student and program assessment lacking in the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District.

The following policies define the expectation for program and student assessment procedures within the district:

- *Policy BBD (Exhibit) Board Members: Training and Orientation* states that the board must adopt a planning and decision-making process consistent with state statute that uses participation, information, research, and evaluation to help achieve the district's vision. This policy also states that the board monitors the effectiveness and efficiency of instructional programs by reviewing reports prepared by or at the direction of the superintendent and directs the superintendent to make modifications that promote maximum achievement for all students.
- *Policy DP (Legal) Personnel Positions* reminds the principal that he/she must consult with the campus-level committee in the planning, operation, supervision, and evaluation of the campus educational program.
- *Policy EHBC (Legal) Special Programs: Compensatory/Accelerated Services* requires the district to use student performance data from state basic skills assessment instruments and achievement tests to design and implement appropriate compensatory or accelerated instructional services for students.

- *Policy EHBD (Legal) Special Programs: Federal Title I Programs* requires the district to review annually the progress of each school receiving Title I funding to determine whether the school is meeting or making adequate progress toward enabling its students to meet the state's student performance standards.
- *Policy EHBF (Legal) Special Programs: Career and Technology Education* states that the district shall annually evaluate its career and technology education programs.
- *Policy EK (Legal) Testing Programs* states that the district may adopt and administer criterion-referenced or norm-referenced assessment instruments, or both, at any grade level, but shall not use the same form of an assessment instrument for more than three years.
- *Policy FB (Legal) Equal Educational Opportunities* requires the district to "draw upon information from a variety of sources, including aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior."

As can be noted from the policies of the district, programs and services provided by the State Compensatory Education funds, Title I funds, and Career and Technology funds must have evaluations. Exhibit 4.1.1 lists the evaluations provided by the district for state and/or federal programs.

Exhibit 4.1.1 List of State and Federal Program Evaluations Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District	
Title of Program Evaluation	Date of Evaluation
Uvalde CISD Section 504 Dyslexia End of Year Evaluation Report	June 12, 2000
Uvalde CISD Bilingual/ESL Program, 1999-2000 School Year	March 6, 2000
Optional Extended Year Program Report	September 19, 2000
Title I, Part A: School Year 1999-2000	June 9, 2000
Title I, Part C: Migrant Programs FY 1999-2000	October 6, 2000
Title II, Part B-Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program	August 8, 2000
Academic 2000, Cycle 2, Year Three: First Things First	July 15, 1999
Uvalde CISD Even Start Program Evaluation Report, 1999-2000	No date
UCISD 1999-2000 Gifted and Talented Education Program, 1999-2000	No date

As can be noted from the list provided above, some of the program evaluations required by board policies are evaluated, such as the Title I program. However, no Career and Technology program evaluation or State Compensatory Education program evaluations were provided to auditors.

One of the data sources used by auditors to determine the extent to which the district had a comprehensive student and program assessment system was a district-generated list of programs provided throughout the district. Exhibit 4.1.2 provides the list that was presented to auditors for review. In addition, the exhibit lists whether the evaluation was descriptive or quantitative. Finally, the exhibit lists the extent to which student results were included in the program evaluation.

<div>Exhibit 4.1.2</div> <div>List of District Programs</div> <div>Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District</div> <div>2001</div>						
Program	Evaluation Provided		Type of Evaluation Designed		Student Results Included	
	Yes	No	Descriptive	Quantitative	Yes	No
Learning Styles (PK-12)		X				
School for the 21 st Century		X				
New Jersey Writing (PK-12)		X				
New Jersey Reading (PK-12)		X				
New Jersey Grammar (PK-12)		X				

Exhibit 4.1.2 (continued) List of District Programs Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District 2001						
Program	Evaluation Provided		Type of Evaluation Designed		Student Results Included	
	Yes	No	Descriptive	Quantitative	Yes	No
Cooperative Discipline (PK-12)		X				
Reading Styles (K-12)		X				
Math Their Way (PK-2)		X				
Math A Way of Thinking (3-5)		X				
Building Math Understanding (6-9)		X				
Technology 2000 (PK-12)		X				
Full Option Science (1-6)		X				
Building World Class Readers (K-6)		X				
Reading Recovery (Robb)	X			X	X	
Sitton Spelling (1-8)		X				
Reading Academies (K-2)	X					
Differentiated Instruction (K-5)		X				
Campus Assistance Teams (PK-12)		X				
Cognitive Modifications (PK-12)		X				
NovaNET (9-12)		X				
TAAS Exit Mastery (Excel)		X				
CEI Reading Labs (PK-12)	X			X	X	
CCC Math Labs (Flores)		X				
Accelerated Reading Program (1-5)		X				
Stevenson Reading (K-4)		X				
Mountain Math (K-4)		X				
Abstinence		X				
Special Education		X				
Head Start		X				
Pre-K Full Day		X				
9 th Grade Initiative		X				
Campus Assistance Teams (PK-12)		X				
Dyslexia	X		X			X
Bilingual/ESL Program	X		X			X
Optional Extended Year Program	X			X	X	
Title I, Part A	X		X			X
Title I, Part C	X		X			X
Title II, Part B - Eisenhower	X		X			X
Academic 2000, Cycle 2	X		X			X
Even Start Program	X			X	X	
Gifted and Talented Program	X		X			X

As can be noted from Exhibit 4.1.2:

- Forty-one (41) programs were reported to be operating in the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District system.
- Some type of program evaluation existed for 12 of the programs.
- Seven (7) of the 12 program evaluations are required by the finding source of the program.
- One program evaluation (CEI Reading Lab) is provided by the company as part of the contract for implementation within the district.
- Four (4) of the 12 program evaluations were designed to include quantitative results. All four of those evaluations reported results in terms of student data.

- Two of the program evaluations were district-designed: the dyslexia program evaluation and the bilingual program evaluation. All others were forms supplied by the funding source.

Interviews of personnel within the district revealed confusion about the expectation for program evaluations. Representative comments included the following:

- “Each campus produces a report or notebook on program evaluation. [They] use the data to look at campus plans.”
- “I am not familiar with the requirement for annual evaluation of objectives.”
- “We track how they enter at 6th grade and show how they do at eighth grade. We tracked even beyond to see if the programs we used are beneficial.”

District personnel revealed the following about evaluations of particular programs:

- “We’ve never really stayed with something long enough to see the results.”
 - “There is absolutely no evaluation of programs in the district.”
 - “We have not monitored the implementation of the Marie Carbo lab.”
 - “The NovaNET evaluations are more informal.”
-
- “We don’t know how students do after they leave. [We have] no program evaluation.”
 - “The Carbo and the Content Mastery labs need to be evaluated. Why aren’t scores going up?”
 - “We may not know exactly what is working.”

However, the Reading Recovery program was reported to have been discontinued. Personnel reported the reason for the discontinuation to have been financial rather than the results that were or were not achieved by the program.

Overall, a written comprehensive plan for student and program assessment is lacking. Furthermore, although auditors found several requirements in policy for a variety of program and student achievement evaluations, the requirement for a comprehensive plan for student and program assessment is not established in policies (see [Finding 1.1](#)). In the absence of policy, district personnel have not designed nor implemented a plan for comprehensive student and program assessment. Inconsistently conducted assessments provide very little information to district and campus personnel for modifying, continuing, or discontinuing programs in light of their effectiveness.

Finding 4.2: The Scope of Student Assessment Is Inadequate for Sound Curriculum and Program Decision Making.

Effective decisions about the design and delivery of the curriculum can be made only when student achievement data are available. A comprehensive assessment system requires that the major learner objectives in each subject area be assessed at each grade level. Without this information, the board of trustees, central and campus administrators, teachers, students, and the community cannot be adequately apprised of the status of the educational programs provided by the district.

To determine the scope of the district’s assessment program, the auditors reviewed appropriate policies and documents related to state and district testing. Auditors also interviewed administrators and teachers to determine the extent to which data were used to enhance the decision-making process. Additionally, all district and campus data tracking forms and systems were examined.

Board policies addressing the testing programs included the following:

- *Policy EK (Legal) Local Achievement testing* gives the district permission to adopt and administer criterion-referenced or norm-referenced assessment instruments, or both, at any grade level.
- *Policy EKB (Legal) Testing Programs: State Assessment Program* notes that the state-wide assessment program shall be primarily performance-based to ensure accountability for student achievement that achieves state goals for public education. This policy also lists the state-assessed content areas, which are reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science.